IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition No. 658 of 2006 (M/B)

1. Raju alias Raj Kumar Singh S/o Bhagwan Das,
   R/o Ward No. 5, Nahar Par, P.S. Sitarganj,
   District Udham Singh Nagar.
2. Jinder Singh S/o Khuswant Singh,
   R/o Ward No. 5, Nahar Par, P.S. Sitarganj,
   District Udham Singh Nagar.
3. Vipin S/o Durga Prasad,
   R/o Ward No. 5, Nahar Par, P.S Sitarganj,
   District Udham Singh Nagar.
4. Santosh S/o Arjun Singh,
   R/o Purani Mandi, P.S. Sitarganj,
   District Udham Singh Nagar. …… Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Uttaranchal.
2. Station House Officer,
   P.S. Bhatrojkhan, Almora.
3. Sandeep Singh,
   S/o Jaswant Singh,
   R/o Ward No. 4, Nahar Par,
   P.S. Sitarganj,
   District Udham Singh Nagar. ……. Respondents

Mr. Tumul Nailwal, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. D.K. Sharma, Government Advocate for respondents Nos. 1 and 2.
None for respondent No. 3.

JUDGMENT

Coram: Hon'ble Rajeev Gupta, C.J.
Hon'ble Prafulla C. Pant, J.

RAJEEV GUPTA, C. J. (Oral)

Mr. Tumul Nailwal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. D.K. Sharma, Government Advocate for respondents Nos. 1 and 2.

None for respondent No. 3.

They are heard on admission.

2. The petitioners are seeking quashing of the First Information Report and the case registered against them at Crime No. 743 of 2006

at Police Station Sitarganj, District Udham Singh Nagar for the alleged commission of the offences punishable under section 307, 352, 394, 452, 504 and 506 of the I.P.C.

3. According to the First Information Report lodged by third respondent Sandeep Singh, the petitioners are alleged to have dealt repeated knife blows on him resulting in multiple injuries. The averments in the First Information Report against the petitioners, prima facie, stand corroborated by the injury report of complainant Sandeep Singh indicating that multiple incised wounds were found on the person of complainant Sandeep Singh.

4. Considering the serious nature of the allegations against the petitioners and the material available before us, we are of the opinion that it is not a fit case warranting interference at this stage.

5. The writ petition, therefore, fails and is, hereby, dismissed summarily.

6. Consequently, CLMA No. 6717 of 2006 also stands dismissed.

(Prafulla C. Pant, J.) **(Rajeev Gupta, C. J.)**
08.06.2006 08.06.2006

G